

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 MOSCOW 17311 151309Z

43

ACTION EA-06

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ISO-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00 INR-05 SAJ-01

SAM-01 PRS-01 EUR-08 VO-01 SCA-01 L-01 RSC-01 /046 W

----- 119925

R 151016Z NOV 74

FM AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4598

INFO CINCPAC

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMCONSUL HONG KONG

AMEMBASSY PARIS

USLO PEKING

AMEMBASSY TAIPEI

AMEMBASSY TOKYO

C O N F I D E N T I A L MOSCOW 17311

LIMDIS

CINCPAC FOR POLAD

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR, CH, UR, US

SUBJ: CHINESE VIEWS ON RELATIONS WITH THE USSR AND USA

1. SUMMARY. A PRC EMBOFF HAS TOLD US THAT THE PRC ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE TO MOSCOW CONTAINED NOTHING NEW, BUT WAS AIMED AT PUBLICIZING PEKING'S POSITION. HE SAID THAT PEKING HAS NO POSITION ON VLADIVOSTOK AS A U.S.-SOVIET SUMMIT SITE, AND WARNED OF SOVIET ATTEMPTS TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF DETENTE. HE SHOWED SOME IRRITATION THAT SINO-U.S. RELATIONS HAD NOT PROGRESSED FURTHER.

2. PRC FIRST SECRETARY LIU KUANG-CHIH TOLD EMBOFF AT JAPANESE EMBOFF'S DINNER PARTY ON NOVEMBER 12 THAT THE CHINESE ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE CONTAINED NOTHING NEW, BUT WAS AN ATTEMPT TO PUBLICIZE THE CHINESE POSITION. THE SOVIETS HAVE OFTEN
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 MOSCOW 17311 151309Z

PUBLICIZED THEIR POSITION, HE SAID, SO PEKING FELT THAT IT WAS

NECESSARY TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT. WHEN EMBOFF ASKED WHY THE NCNA PEOPLE HERE HAD CALLED THE MESSAGE TO THE ATTENTION OF THE WESTERN PRESS AS THOUGH IT CONTAINED SOMETHING NEW, LIU SAID THAT HE WAS NOT AWARE THAT NCNA HAD DONE SO. IN ANY CASE, HE SAID, THE MESSAGE WAS NEW IN THE SENSE THAT PREVIOUS CHINESE MESSAGES HAD NOT CONTAINED SUCH DETAILS. BUT THE DETAILS THEMSELVES WERE NOT NEW. HE DID NOT EXPECT ANY FAVORABLE SOVIET RESPONSE. ON THE CONTRARY, HE SAID, THE SOVIETS HAD THE MESSAGE TEN HOURS BEFORE GROMYKO SPOKE ON NOVEMBER 6. THE CHINESE VIEW HIS NEGATIVE REMARKS AND THE CURSORY PRESS TREATMENT AS A PRELIMINARY ANSWER.

3. ON VLADIVOSTOK AS THE SITE FOR THE SOVIET-U.S. SUMMIT, LIU SAID FLATLY THAT HIS GOVERNMENT HAS NO POSITION. "WHERE YOU CHOOSE TO MEET DOES NOT CONCERN US." HE WENT ON TO DISPARAGE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SUCH MEETINGS IN GENERAL AND OF THE SOVIET-U.S. AGREEMENTS REACHED TO DATE AND SEEMED SURPRISED AT THE EXTENT OF LOWER LEVEL EXCHANGES WHICH HAVE FOLLOWED FROM THE PREVIOUS U.S.-SOVIET SUMMIT AGREEMENTS. HE IMPLIED STRONGLY THAT HE FELT MOSCOW HAD GAINED MORE FROM DETENTE THAN WASHINGTON, AND THAT THE U.S. SHOULD BE MORE WARY OF THE SOVIETS.

4. ON ASIAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY, HE SAID THAT MOSCOW'S INTENTION WAS TO DRIVE THE U.S. OFF THE INDIAN SUB-CONTINENT AND OUT OF THE INDIAN OCEAN, INCLUDING "YOUR BASE AT DIEGO GARCIA." HE IMPLIED THAT WE SHOULD SEEK TO THWART SUCH A MOVE, I.E., STRENGTHEN OUR RELATIONS WITH THE COUNTRIES OF THE REGION AND MAINTAIN OUR PRESENCE IN THE INDIAN OCEAN.

5. IN A CURIOUS FOLLOW-UP TO A BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT SECRETARY KISSINGER'S FORTHCOMING TRIP TO PEKING, LIU STATED AS HIS PERSONAL OPINION THAT HE DID NOT SHARE THE AMERICAN OR WESTERN ADMINATION FOR KISSINGER. HE THOUGHT THAT THE SECRETARY'S NUMEROUS TRIPS HAD NOT REALLY ACCOMPLISHED MUCH. "I HAVE ALSO HEARD SOME OF OUR LEADERS SAY THAT THEY DO NOT THINK MUCH OF KISSINGER'S WORLD VIEWS," HE CONTINUED. THEN SWITCHING TO ANOTHER TARGET, HE SAID THAT HE HAD READ

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 MOSCOW 17311 151309Z

CAREFULLY AMBASSADOR BRUCE'S REMARKS AFTER LEAVING PEKING. IT WAS EVIDENT FROM HIS REMARKS, SAID LIU, THAT BRUCE WAS FUNDAMENTALLY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST CLASS. (LIU'S REMARKS WERE MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF A JAPANESE EMBOFF, WHO WAS OPENLY AMAZED AND ASKED LATER, "WHAT WAS THAT SUPPOSED TO MEAN?")

6. AS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE IRRITATIONS WHICH NOW MARK

SINO-U.S. RELATIONS, LIU SAID THAT CHINESE OFFICIALS
ASSIGNED TO THE PRC LIASON OFFICE IN WASHINGTON ARE GIVEN
A CATEGORY OF VISAS WHICH DOES NOT EXEMPT THEM FROM CUSTOMS
INSPECTIONS, WHEREAS AMERICANS ASSIGNED TO PEKING ARE EXEMPT
FROM SUCH FORMALITIES.

7. COMMENT. LIU'S "PERSONAL" VIEWS MAY BE A CHINESE ATTEMPT
TO SHOW THAT THEY ARE NOT HAPPY WITH THE PROGRESS IN SOVIET-U.S.
RELATIONS AND WITH THE RELAT-
IVE STATUS QUO IN SINO-U.S. RELATIONS.
STOESSEL

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: PERSONAL OPINION, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, VLADIVOSTUK, SUMMIT MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 NOV 1974
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: cunninfx
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974MOSCOW17311
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740330-0446
From: MOSCOW
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741140/aaaabhmvtel
Line Count: 126
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: cunninfx
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 MAY 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 MAY 2002 by rowelle0>; APPROVED <18 MAR 2003 by cunninfx>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CHINESE VIEWS ON RELATIONS WITH THE USSR AND USA
TAGS: PFOR, CH, UR, US, (KISSINGER, HENRY A)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005